

Draft Meeting Minutes – Preview of JGPO Re-Initiation Biological Assessment

In attendance:

USFWS

Navy

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Federal Building – USFWS, Ecological Services, Oahu

A. CC informed USFWS that JGPO intends to request formal consultation on October 1, 2014. USFWS mentioned they are expecting USAF to request formal consultation for the THAAD on October 15th. In addition, a separate request for consultation is anticipated for the USAF clearing at runway.

B. LT mentioned USFWS preference for the USAF proponent to combine its action with the Army action as it applies to structure of the consultation.

C. CC provided a graphic identifying the key differences between 2010 Final EIS and 2014 Draft SEIS. Graphic is from Version 4 of the SEIS and explains the major differences between the previous proposed action and current actions as it pertains to extent, project areas, land acquisition, etc.

D. CC discussed the 2010 ROD retained actions. Key point is the 2010 ROD retained actions are NOT addressed in the SEIS. The SEIS and the BA do not match in the impacts analysis. The BA is comprehensive and includes both the 2010 ROD retained actions and the 2014 SEIS preferred alternative (Alternative E).

E. CC pointed out that the list now includes the Mariana gray swiftlet. The species was not discussed during the Navy/USFWS meeting on Guam in May 2014. The reason for inclusion of the Mariana gray swiftlet is due to the NMS training that was addressed in the 2010 ROD.

F. CC gave an explanation of why the Mariana common moorhen and Micronesian megapode are not addressed in the BA. LT discussed and asked for clarifications on the rationale behind including moorhen in the 2010 BA/BO, but not in the 2014 BA.

1. Impacts to the moorhen were anticipated in 2010 as part of the construction and live-fire exercises occur at the proposed Tinian firing ranges.
2. The 2010 ROD retained actions related to the DAR roads is in the BA but no impacts to moorhens are anticipated. Future road projects are not part of the SEIS any impacts to threatened or endangered species would need to be addressed under a separate consultation with FHWA.
3. LT expressed concern as to whether or not the follow on FHWA projects in the SEIS will be addressed as a part of the consultation – it appears they are interrelated, therefore impacts should be included in the NEPA doc and BA. CC – FHWA distinction has been made – impacts resulting from future road projects are not analyzed in this BA1B. LT requested further clarification on the rationale for removing the road improvement projects from the BA.

G. CC – Explained the premise of U&SI and the building chronology of the projects and how there will be a list of construction projects in BA with recovery habitat acreages associated with each. CC- explained how the reduced footprint impacts the number of construction workers.

H. KY – Asked if the separated main cantonment and housing, result in a need to go back out to the public or scoping and display this alternative in this form, within the SEIS. CC- not anticipated; SEIS addressed the individual components of the new preferred alternative so the information was available to the public.

I. LT - As it applies to the training anticipated at NMS, will this training involve the crossing of streams or wetlands or utilization of areas in close proximity to these features? Action Item #3 Navy: Review training regime and locations with previously collected data at NMS to ensure effects determinations for moorhen in those locales is up to date.

J. Comparison of Recovery Habitat Impacts between 2010 and 2014 Proposed Action. CC – Pointed out that the graphic was based on a graphic in the 2010 BO. The graphic replicates the first 4 lines of the 2010 BO but has been revised to reflect the 2014 proposed action and the decrease in impacts to recovery habitat from 2010 to 2014. LT/CC: Discussion and clarification on *Serianthes nelsonii* and how it was treated during the 2010 BO. CC – *Serianthes nelsonii* was not addressed in the 2010 BO however, recovery habitat criteria was developed by the USFWS during that time and Navy was provided with the recovery habitat shapefiles (for all species) provided during the 2010 consultation.

K. Discussion of 3 slides on Best Management Practices (BMPs). CC – prefaced BMP’s and the parallel nature of these to the SEIS.

L. Conservation Measures Table. Explained the list of conservation measures and their respective status.

1. USDA BTS Interdiction – CC mentioned that the old language out of the 2010 BO was utilized for this section of the BA. CC reviewed our historic approach of determining an increase in interdiction needs since the program’s inception (meeting with USDA to identify increases in inspections, as well as discussions regarding the metric or unit to track which would identify (prior to an increase) such a need). CC/JH brought up the USDA NWRC Interdiction Analysis Project – status not known at this time. Concluded with group discussion on the complicated nature of household moves and emphasis placed on this aspect of interdiction.

2. BTS Research and Suppression. BTS Research Strategic Plan – went over how in the past for JGPO projects the prioritization exercise worked, but we’re trying to line up with the BTS working group research goals;

3. NBG ungulate fence (LT – overlap of INRMP with this conservation measure). KY – how do we make more certainty that they will eradicate all of them. LT – Call out when JRM will take over the fence maintenance in the BA; CC – we’ll look at adding text to explain the transition from USMC BO requirements to INRMP management.

4. *Serianthes* : Will *Serianthes* be part of the forest enhancement. CC – yes. It is identified as on the list of native species to be included in forest enhancement.

5. Does the BA talk about vibration impacting sea turtles, or the lights from the range impacting the turtles at Ritidian? Will it occur during peak turtle breeding season? CC went through the firing regime and timing. LT - Will it give off vibration down below?

6. Rota biologist – CC- went through history of the 2010 BO and our execution of the University of Montana Cooperative Agreement, then NDAA blocking expenditures. Rota biologist is not part of the current BA conservation measures since the focus of the conservation measures was on Guam because of the potential to reintroduce species on Guam. KY – need a feeder population, in addition to Guam.

RR – Use of ERA's? CC – it may be a part of SEIS; it isn't part of the BA because all we can commit to is developing a proposal.

CC – Current vegetation at North Finegayan (left) is herbaceous scrub and secondary limestone forest.

CC – Replacement of the ISR Strike fence is addressed as part of the proposed action. BA discusses fencing the area referred to as "North Finegayan (right)." RR – How are you affecting the ISR requirement? ISR/NWF...mitigate for both disturbances. In the LFTRC section of the BA, CC has the breakdown of acreages for ISR and NWF consultations and explains how the acreages were derived. The MPMG will impact the fence. When DON and USFWS met in May, USFWS expressed concern regarding expanding the fence at NWF to include the LFTRC. There have been subsequent conversations about how to appropriately address the change in the NWF Beddown informal consultation and the ISR Strike formal consultation. KY – one option is a memo to file for each of the consultations. RR – what type of designation comes with these fences; are they forever locked in conservation. CC – no. DoD cannot commit in perpetuity due to the need for mission flexibility to address changes in mission.

M. KY – Proposed species going to Federal Register this week, species list has to be into the Federal Register before end of FY. Expect the notification in the Federal Register in early Oct. CC – when it goes out in register – we'll request conference if there are species affected by our proposed action. Critical habitat proposal is several months behind....at local office in the next few weeks, but then it goes to DC. No specific date for when to expect critical habitat proposal.

N. LT – Question about snail and butterfly presence/absence information for NMS. Question about the effects of training in NMS on listed species. Concern about the effect of the proposed action on moorhens in NMS. DON to review and ensure Mariana common moorhen should not be included in BA.

O. KY – How does the proposal being worked out at the DC level affect this BA? CC – Our direction is to proceed with the conservation measures presented today. No changes are anticipated.

P. Question about critical habitat determination in BA. May affect, not likely to adversely affect. Determination based on 2004 critical habitat discussion in the Federal Register.

-LT: Fed register vague about noise, doesn't specify type of noise.

-KY: The effects to all bats in that zone need to be evaluated, not just the LFTRC.

-LT: USMC that surveys the SDZ's need to be aware of turtle nests.

Q. Notes and POC for Consultation

- (b) (6) are recipients of BA; primary POC's
- DON will prepare meeting notes to USFWS for comment/review and approval of meeting minute notes
- Plan to meet the week of October 20th to discuss the status of the BA. Re-initiation planned for October 1st.
- 1 Hard copy for Guam / 1 Hard for USFWS; digitals for all

R. KY - (b) (6) with retire OCT 1st of the month.